

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 6 are independent claims. Claim 7 is cancelled in the present application.

Drawing Objections

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claims. Specifically, the Office Action identifies the elements “first transmitting device”, “second transmitting device”, “third transmitting device”, and “fourth transmitting device” from claims 1-4. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

Figure 1 discloses the system of the invention including several servers and computers 1, 2, and 3. Figure 2 discloses the structure of the center server 3. The center server (computer) of Figure 2 includes a communication circuit (11) for implementing the communication of data between computers. As noted in the specification of the present application at page 8, lines 4-7, the client computer 1 and service servers 2 have similar structure. Thus, Figure 2 provides drawing support for all not only the center server but additionally the service server and personal computer shown in Figure 1 as well. In light of this, the communication circuit (11) is an embodiment of the first, second and third transmitting devices of the claims providing proper drawing support for these claim elements.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Insofar as they pertain to the currently pending claims, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

MKM/NYM/cm

Applicants first wish to note that the alleged rejections of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are more properly characterized as objections under 37 C.F.R. § 1.71(a) in that the claim meaning may easily be understood. However, the attached amendments correct the concerns noted by the examiner without narrowing claim scope.

The term “personal computer” in claim 1 is has been corrected to “client computer” to correct this antecedent basis concern. This overcomes the examiners concerns with respect to dependent claim 2 as well. The term “content server” in claim 1 refers to the “content of a service” recited earlier in claim 1 and thus has been corrected to “service server” in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. Thus, the amendments to the claims overcome the examiners concerns and all claims should now be allowable. Withdraw of the Section 112, second paragraph rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claim 6 has been rewritten to overcome the examiners concerns with respect to setting forth the invention in proper terms. Claim 6 has been amended to address these concerns. Dependent claim 7 is cancelled, rendering its rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 moot.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that the currently pending claims are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115142 by Brickell et al. (hereafter “Brickell”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168 to Mighdoll et a. (hereafter “Mighdoll”). Insofar as they pertain to the currently pending claims, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 1, an element of the claim recites “sending said client computer data indicating the service list” where the service list “includes service content and

network address of said service server.” Brickell discloses “systems and methods for providing an authentication service, including an identity authentication portfolio system.” (Para. 0017).

Brickell teaches a system where the user, the relying party, and the authentication server correspond to the client computer, the center server, and the service server, respectively. After the user accesses the relying party and the relying party accesses the authentication server, permission is given to the user in accordance with the level of assurance provided by the authentication. (Para. 0019). Brickell fails to teach or suggest “sending said client computer data indicating the service list” where the service list “includes service content and network address of said service server” as required by independent claim 1.

Mighdoll discloses a method for “providing a document to a client coupled server.” (Col. 2, lines 37-38). Mighdoll uses a ticket-based system for authentication where information such as user name and email address is transmitted to the client in the form of an electronic ticket that allows them access to a certain set of services. The client submits the ticket to the services to determine if the user is able to access a particular service (Col 15, lines 1-19). Mighdoll also fails to teach or suggest “sending said client computer data indicating the service list” where the service list “includes service content and network address of said service server” as required by independent claim 1.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Mighdoll does not remedy the defects in the teachings of Brickell and that therefore Brickell and Mighdoll do not establish, either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) a prima facie obviousness of independent claim 1 as well as claims depending therefrom. Applicants further submit that claims 2 and 3 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection insofar as it pertains to the currently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 4 contains the requirement of “sending the client computer data indicating the service list” where the service list “includes service content and network address

of said service server.” Independent claim 5 contains the requirement of “sending the client computer data indicating the service list” where the service list “includes service content and network address of the service server.” Independent claim 6 contains the requirement to “send data indicating the generated service list to a client computer” where the service list “includes service content and network address of the service server.” Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned requirements of independent claims 4-6 are substantially similar to the aforementioned requirement of independent claim 1 as to be analogous. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections on the same grounds as those set forth for independent claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant’s representative, Michael Mutter (Reg. No. 29,680) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution .

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **August 17, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant